REMARKS

Claims 77-81 remain pending in the application. The prior ground of rejection of claims 77 and 79 as being anticipated by Munk has been withdrawn, and twenty-five new grounds of rejection of the five pending claims have been entered. The 25 grounds of rejection appear to cover every possible combination and permutation of U.S. Patents to Hines, Schlom et al., Foster-Pegg, Miller, and Munk, British patent to Bronicki et al., and publications of Kolp et al., Foster-Pegg, DeLucia et al., and EPRI as listed in the PTO-892. These grounds of rejection are traversed.

The outstanding Office action is not in compliance with MPEP § 706.02, as the prior art rejections are not confined strictly to the best available art, but are cumulative and needlessly prolix. For example, claims 77-80 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Kolp et al., and claims 77-80 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kolp et al. in view of EPRI, and over Kolp et al. in view of Schlom et al. and over Kolp et al. in view of Hines, and claims 77-81 are further rejected as being unpatentable over Kolp et al. in view of Munk and Kolp et al. in view of Hines and Munk. As such, the Office action presents an unnecessary and undue burden on Applicant in responding to 25 different grounds of rejection of five claims presented. According to the MPEP, cumulative or redundant grounds of rejection are to be avoided.

The rejections of claims 77 and 79 as being anticipated by the Foster-Pegg article, claims 77-80 as being anticipated by Miller, Bronicki, Kolp et al. and DeLucia et al., claims 77, 79 and 81 as being unpatentable over Foster-Pegg article in view of Munk, claims 77-80 as being unpatentable over Hines in view of Kolp et al., Kolp et al. in view of EPRI, Kolp et al. in view Schlom et al., DeLucia et al in view Schlom et al, DeLucia et al in view of EPRI, Bronicki et al in view of Schlom et al, Foster-Pegg article in view of EPRI, and the rejection of claims 77-81 as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Munk, Bronicki et al in view of Munk, Kolp et al in view of Munk, Kolp et al in view of EPRI and Munk, Kolp et al in view of Schlom et al and Munk, DeLucia et al in view of Munk, DeLucia et al in view Schlom et al and Munk, DeLucia et al in view of EPRI and

Munk, Hines in view of Kolp et al and Munk, Bronicki et al in view Schlom et al and Munk, and Foster-Pegg article in view of EPRI and Munk, are respectfully traversed.

Miller discloses a gas turbine having a compressor divided into two or more stages, as shown in Figs. 2 and 3, with adiabatic intercooling between the stages. Kolp et al and Foster-Pegg are described in the specification. The Munk reference has been described in Applicant's prior response. None of Miller, Kolp et al., Foster-Pegg, Foster-Pegg article, DeLucia, EPRI, Bronicki et al, Schlom et al, or Hines, disclose or suggest a gas turbine system having a supercharging subsystem and at least one fogger located upstream of a gas turbine subsystem input airstream, wherein the gas turbine system is operated to provide maximum generator design rated output at summer-peaking temperatures as set forth in sole independent claim 77.

As shown in Fig. 1, gas turbines and associated generators are rated based on turbine capacity at 40 to 50 degrees F inlet air temperature, such that the generators are designed (i.e., sized) to have maximum output at 59 degrees F. As ambient temperature rises to summer-peaking conditions, the output of the system decreases. According to the present invention, a combination of a supercharging subsystem and a fogger are provided to a gas turbine system to enable the system to achieve maximum power output at summer-peaking conditions, see Fig. 6 and pp. 14-15 of the specification.

None of the prior art references relied upon in the prolix grounds of rejection teaches such operation. Each of the prior art references may disclose the use of either supercharging or inlet air cooling to increase power output, but in each case the increased power output would simply raise the curve shown in Fig. 1, and not change the shape of the curve, as shown in Fig. 6 for example, according to the present invention.

As a result, none of the prior art references is able to increase the power output from a gas turbine system at high ambient temperatures other than by simply increasing the size of the components of the system. See, e.g., Miller at col. 8, l. 75 to col. 9, l. 4. Munk also fails to disclose such operation. Merely because Munk may disclose th us

OFFICIAL

of a microprocessor as asserted in the Office action, does not mean that Munk discloses operation of a gas turbine system to achieve maximum design rated output at summer-peaking temperatures. In contrast, the present invention as set forth in claim 77 is able to obtain increased power output at high ambient temperatures without increasing the sizing of system components beyond their maximum design rated output, which as shown in Fig. 1 is designed for maximum output at low ambient temperatures between 40 - 60 degrees F.

Because none of the prior art references discloses a system as set forth in claim 77, no combination of such references would result in such a system. Since claims 78-81 depend from claim 77, they include all the limitations of claim 77 and also cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious by any combination of the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, further and favorable reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all outstanding grounds of rejection, and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,					
NAME AND REG. NUMBER	Vincent M. DeLuca Attorney for Applicant Reg. No. 32,408				
SIGNATURE	Vincent M DeLuca	DATE	9 SEP 03		
Address	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck, p.c. Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.				
City	Washington	*State*	D.C.	*Zip Code*	20005
Country	U.S.A.	*Telephone*	202-783-6040	*Fax*	202-783-6031

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK

1425 K Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005

Telephone: (202)783-6040
Facsimile: (202)783-6031

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

DATE: September 9, 2003

TO: Examiner John Belena
Group Art Unit 3746
FAX NO: 703-872-9302

FROM: Vincent M. DeLuca

RE: Serial No. 10/009,195

Number of Pages Including This Transmittal Sheet: 7

MESSAGE, IF ANY: